Laureen P. Cantwell
INFO 667 – Research Collections
Prof. Howard D. White
Final Assignment
Due: March 7, 2011

PART ONE: Things to Know

6. Major authors

The top two methods one can use to establish a list of well-known and oft-cited authors within the field of Graphic Arts and Typography would be to utilize search features within Web of Science's ISI Citation Indexes and within OCLC's WorldCat database.

ISI Citation Indexes: Using ISI Web of Science's Arts & Humanities Citation Index (A&CHI), one can conduct a topical search and use the Analyze Results feature to display records ranked by author(s) frequency. Example, searching A&HCI for:

typograph* OR typeset* OR printmak* OR "graphic design"

and then analyzing the results by author, we can see that "Heller, S⟦teven⟧" is the top (named) author within this topic search.

WorldCat: After conducting an expert search in WorldCat, the "Related Authors" feature at the top of the results page allows users to view a list of the top authors from the results set. Example, an Expert Search in World Cat for:

lc: z242.9 OR lc: z243.* OR lc: z244.* OR lc: z245.* OR lc: z246.* OR

lc: z247.* OR lc: z248.* OR lc: z249.* OR lc: z250

and limiting results to Books and Serials, we see that Philip B. Meggs is listed as the top author, while Steven Heller (the top author from the A&HCI results) is not listed. Heller comes up as the third author if one limits the years of the results to include only the last one or two decades. (It's worth noting that Meggs is not at all mentioned in A&HCI's top 10 author results.)

Additionally, search and retrieval features within GoogleScholar and within Publish-or-Perish are also valuable, not only for the sake of comparison, but also for the additional information they may provide. In Google Scholar, one can search very nearly the same way as in A&HCI, but altering the terms with the understanding that Google automatically

truncates when searching. Example: searching *typography OR typeset OR printmaking OR "graphic design"* in Google Scholar indicates that the most cited title, of books *and* articles, is Meggs' *A History of Graphic Design* (1998). [Publish-or-Perish](#) can be used to search particular authors, titles, and articles for popularity/usage data and uses Google Scholar to obtain its citations. Example, if one searches PoP for *"philip b. meggs" OR "pb meggs"* the title Heller, S. & Meggs, P. B. *Texts on Type; Critical Writings on Typography*. New York: Allworth Press, 2001. is *by far* the most cited published piece by Meggs -- and he co-wrote it with Heller.

The nature of the results retrieved from searching all four of these resources indicate that quantity of published items by an author and times cited for authors/titles can be tricky to navigate but that on the whole, the use of several resources should provide enough indications of the important authors of a field for at least a basic to instructional knowledge of authors of note. A final resource would certainly be looking into LC Name Authority Headings for Meggs, Heller, and others from the WorldCat and A&HCI author lists -- where we can see that Heller has more than seven times the number of items attributed to him than Meggs does. This may give a perspective alongside (or in contrast to) results from Google Scholar and PoP, indicating who has been influential historically, and who has been influential in more contemporary times. While foreign language authors do not seem to abound currently, one or two would/could come up in WorldCat Related Author lists and may also be worth checking in LC headings.

23. Major existing library collections in the field

When it comes to the topic of Graphic Arts and Typography, one might make the assumption that institutes of higher education that have their own press (such as [Duke University](#)) might contain powerful, even research-level, collections within this field. This may not always, or even often, be the case. At times, there may be a historical interest (such as the [History of Printing](#) collection at Dartmouth College, which also holds a long-standing [Graphic Arts Workshop](#)) at an institution uninvolved with the ARL and thus often overlooked by those looking for university research library collections. Beyond the institutions used in the Collection Evaluation Report (UPenn, Drexel, Duke, and the University of Chicago), Google search results for the query: *site:.edu typography* indicates that the University of Minnesota, Rutgers, UCLA, Yale, Northwestern, Stanford, and Carnegie Mellon would indicate that *these* institutions of higher education may be those with more powerful collections if a coverage power test were to be conducted through WorldCat.

Original Group from Brief Test:

Coverage Power Tests	UPenn (PAU)	Duke (NDD)	Chicago (CGU)	Drexel (DXU)
RLG Level	2	2	2	2
WLN Level	2b	2a	2b	2b

Coverage Power Test Results from Additional Institutions, after the Google search:

Coverage Power Tests	UMinn	Rutgers	UCLA	Yale	Northwestern	Stanford	Carnegie Mellon	Dartmouth
RLG Level	4	3	3	4	2	2	2	3
WLN Level	4	3a	3b	4	2b	2b	2b	3a

You can easily see that 5 of the 8 schools noted above received coverage power test marks *higher* than those universities first tested under the assumption of powerful collections in this field, partly due to their maintaining their own university press. Searching Google may provide at the very least a starting list for "likely suspects" ~ who might have a strong collection in a given literature (as in the case of UMinn, Rutgers, UCLA, and Yale). Conversational anecdotes, as acquired through discussion(s) with those having a vested interest in the subject, may also prove worthy of a deeper look. Scholars who have sought out resources in a field (including collections, workshops and conferences, as with Dartmouth) will also be able to provide direction regarding institutions they have found to be most helpful in their quest.

30. Professional and scholarly organizations related to the field

Several professional and scholarly organizations exist for the benefit of those engaged in the field of Graphic Design and Typography. Simple but illuminating Google searches include: (1) typographer association; and (2) typographer association scholarly.

AIGA, once an acronym for the American Institute of Graphic Design, currently defines itself as "the professional association for design" and is based in Manhattan. Site sections include Professional Resources; Education; Design & Business; Society & Environment; Writing; and Inspiration. Or particular note may be: (1) Inspiration for design archives, medalists, and fellows for current and retrospective information regarding significant designs, contributions, and individuals in the field; (2) Professional Resources for AIGA's ethics statement, salary/employment information and studies, and forums on such topics as information design, professional practices, illustration, and typography; and (3) Writing, where *Voice* (AIGA's journal of design) and other AIGA publications, as well as the Winterhouse Awards for Design Writing and Criticism, may be found. On an international level, the Association Typographique Internationale (or ATypI) is a not-for-profit organization administered in the United States, with members in over 40 countries endeavoring to "preserve the culture, tradition and history of type and typography" as well as running conferences and publishing journals and other publication types. They grant awards to both young professionals (the Prix Charles Peignot for Excellence in Type Design goes back to 1982; Peignot founded ATypI); offer a Who's Who of their organization, with biographical information on their Board, past presidents, and country delegates; and annual conference information.

Established in 1991, the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading & Publishing (SHARP) offers a wealth of information for the librarian/preservationist/archivist as well as the scholars within this field and markets itself as "a global scholarly society" with over 1000 members across nearly two-dozen countries. Additionally, "SHARP works in concert with affiliated academic organizations around the world to support the study of book history and print culture." A quote by *Edward Tenner* (historian of culture and technology) on their homepage indicates that SHARP has value for students, who will require preparation "to be discerning users of, and contributors to, all media." Perhaps most important on this site, their Resources link provides access to not only Series & Journals and Online Exhibits & Blogs, but also to information on Archives & Collections, Research Tools, additional Scholarly Societies, and a section on Teaching & Programs (national and international). Furthermore, one should note that, on each page of Resources, a search feature permits the exploration of valuable features such as subject area (including Typography and Library History), time periods, geographic regions, and languages of interest (including Hieroglyphics). Also worth mentioning, the Society of Typographic Arts (STA) has its headquarters in Chicago, was created in 1927, was the

American Center for Design in the 1980s, and focuses on the professional and student individual needs within the field of graphic arts in the greater Chicago region. They have a history with seminar and conference sponsorship and with publication development, including *Hermann Zapf and His Design Philosophy* (1987; #16 on my list of 40 selected titles for the Collection Evaluation Report).

PART TWO

3. We have seen that research libraries collect titles at Minimal and Basic levels on the RLG scale. In these hard-pressed times, what justification can you give for that? Why not confine collections to titles directed solely at the most advanced readers in science and scholarship?

This question pertains to the course material discussing models for research collections (and collect*ing* for those collections) as well as instances where debate regarding defining the *quality* of a collection occurs. An obvious, but no less important, thing to remember is that many libraries collect at the Minimal and Basic levels, that's why these levels have items held at the *most* number of institutions. In a way, a research library should be able to handle the information needs of a topic of interest/value to their institution at least as well as a smaller or less prestigious or non-ARL-member library can. That would be the primary justification.

Why shouldn't libraries focus their collecting efforts, instead, on the literature needs of the most advanced readers for a literature? The ARL Principles of Membership highlights values, goals, interests, and needs deemed important for status as a member library, where the "breadth and quality" or library collections are of primary concern, as are the usefulness of the collections by the institution's community. Not *all* users of a community will require electronic resources for every need they have, but many will find them convenient and thus make more use of them over time. By the same token, not *all* users of a community will require the highest level of resources to satisfy their information need; perhaps only a very few will need such resources over the course of a given year. And yet, to be part of ARL, a research library must encourage national/global interest in their resources through such networks as WorldCat (ILL), be innovative with technology (e-resources for users), *and* a certain quantity of resources available within a given literature. Since there are always more items considered to be at the Minimal and Basic levels, it would

serve that such items would create a baseline or a foundation for a collection upon which the Instructional and Research levels of collecting can rest.

Does that mean that a research library should have every title *ever* produced at *all* levels of a literature? Certainly not. Not only would that be a bit impractical but the question of quality rears its head again. A research library should have not only quantity but items of excellence and value as well. We read in the very first lecture of this course an excerpt from *Brief Tests of Collection Strength* which indicates that the two determinants of collection quality are love and, of course, money. Because money is hard-won and limited, budgets often determine priorities. Carole Palmer's chapter, "Thematic Research Collections," in *Companion to Digital Humanities,* she states that "many research libraries are focusing on more global approaches to digital collection building by producing expansive gateways for all their user communities." (Palmer, p.17) This means that not only the level of collection (Minimal, Basic, etc.) but also the *formats* collected are important for a collection to be determined prestigious. Palmer also states that academic subject expertise is also important. (Palmer, p.7) Overall, collecting for a research library should no doubt bring in a wealth of Minimal and Basic titles, but a prestigious collection of a given literature (one that supports at the upper undergraduate levels, and perhaps well into PhD studies) should also support the careful selection of formats and curriculum/curricula support within the library. This could mean electronic resources, cooperative ILL networking, subject specialist staffing, and titles at the Instructional and Research levels. There is no definitive answer as to what precise level a given research library should collect at for a literature, but ARL principles, collection strength assessments, and the institutional academic and library investment influence collection development work heavily.

7. A problem for brief tests is that recently published items might not have been cataloged yet and so can't be included in a test. Or, if cataloged, the items might still have far lower holdings counts than they will ultimately attain. Propose and describe one or more ways of evaluating a research library's coverage of recent materials. (Your proposal needn't relate to brief tests or coverage power tests.)

Brief tests have several challenges that affect their outcomes and, by extension, their validity. Recently published items prove a particular area of struggle, until they have been cataloged within owner libraries and they are often not able to be included in a brief test. Related to that, libraries often take months to acquire titles so that "new" books may not always be titles published recently so much as within the past 2-5 years; partly this is due to the nature of a certain literature. Physical and natural sciences have increased their publishing of articles in the electronic realm markedly over the last 5-10 years; it is the same

for legal research. Many of the humanities, however, still publish substantially in the monographic format, but the process of publication review is often quite slow which can delay libraries in acquiring an item. Yet users often have concerns about a library's holdings, or lack thereof, of items published since 2000 – instructors, too, often prefer the use of the most recent textbook edition, or order a newer print of a book for the bookstore/syllabus rather than an older one. How can we assess these collections for recent items?

In most search engines that allow for the exploration of literature(s), date of publication *is* a sortable, or at least searchable, field. Several helpful tools were discussed in Part One above. Google Scholar allows for this in the advanced search feature; ISI Citation Indexes allow for not only the limiting of publication date, but also the analysis of citation frequency over time; Publish or Perish (or PoP) can help in looking at author popularity (at times a direct association with prestige) or item popularity as well. With these resources in mind, I would suggest evaluating the coverage of a research library's holdings of recent items for a literature with a multifaceted approach that culminates with reflecting the results against a scale – similar to the approaches we've used for many of the tests and assessments conducted in this course.

Ideally, first searching by topic (in, say, ISI or Google Scholar) or by LC call number range (in WorldCat) and then limit results by date to 2000-2011, or whatever range seems most appropriate. In the topic searches, you'll want to look for items that have been cited the most, focusing at least on the first page of results – perhaps the top ten to twenty items. In WorldCat, the logic would be much the same. With these lists, it would be important to note titles that are present on *both* lists – thus developing a sense of most cited, most purchased items for a given time period. Then, starting with this relatively small group, which we could call the "should haves", note which items your institution holds. Items only on *one* of these lists could be thought of as the "should considers". Depending on the overall size of these lists, you may want to look at all of them concurrently, or simply prioritize the "should haves" if that list has enough substance to be valuable for assessment on its own. Evaluation could be done as follows: If you hold 75% or more of these titles, this would indicate you institution is taking strides to acquire recent titles within a literature. If you hold 50%-74% of these items, that's still pretty good. Under 50% indicates that either a literature is not of much current collection development interest, that the curriculum is moving away from an instructional or research level interest in a topic, or that collection development of recent items needs to "step up" for this literature.

16. Read this chapter by a faculty member in the library school at the University of Illinois: Palmer, Carole L. (2004). Thematic Research Collections. In *Companion to Digital Humanities*, edited by Susan Schreibman, Ray Siemens, and John

Unsworth. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 348-365. *Using Palmer's descriptions, concretely describe a thematic research collection you would like to create in a field of interest to you.*

Palmer indicates that projects associated with the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities (IATH) have a substantial number of shared characteristics that may lend themselves towards helping one decide on a thematic research collection for development. With that in mind, having looked into the initiatives there (and I've even used the Piers Plowman Electronic Archive), I would create a thematic collection specifically focused on Historic Women Poets from the Seven Sisters Schools. While this is primarily an author-based theme, it touches topics beyond the literary realm and brings in a historical element as well, even some sociological phenomena as college-educated women in the United States began to substantiate their place in the literary world. This "microcosm" would provide scholarly research support within a virtual environment, while also requiring an amount of scholarly research *and* collection development to create the resource itself.

Coherent and heterogeneous virtual collection of this kind would take a fair amount of work to collocate and coordinate with the libraries of these schools. As primary, secondary, and tertiary sources will be valuable parts of the thematic collection, all types should be sought and either be available digitally, or have cited/reproductions of the vital information within available for the user. Examples for this collection might include:

- Primary sources: Online exhibits, such as the one regarding Elizabeth Bishop through the Vassar College Libraries though it is not vast in size; search results for "Emily Dickinson" in NINES (the Nineteenth Century Scholarship Online resource) where genres of literature can be narrowed to letters, poetry, and free resources. Out of copyright items available through the GoogleBooks project may also be of interest here.
- Secondary sources: Critical resources and Responses to Dickinson's writing from the Dickinson Electronic Archives; and the Elizabeth Bishop Project website at Vassar College.
- Tertiary sources: Wikipedia articles on individual Seven Sisters schools and notable alumnae poets mentioned there, and their Wikipedia entries, when available (such as Sylvia Plath from Smith; Elizabeth Bishop from Vassar; Emily Dickinson from Mount Holyoke; Marianne Moore from Bryn Mawr; Helen Hoyt from Barnard; Adrienne Rich from Radcliffe; and Bing Xin from Wellesley). Parts of the Dickinson Electronic Archives could also be considered tertiary sources.

As the above consist of potential inclusions for such a thematic collection, all of them are not necessarily items that achieve the desired *contextual mass*, but they are certainly a start. The divisions above are more for the sake of clarity and breadth rather than the display of

"meaningful interrelationships" between the resources, which should reflect the "pedagogical intent" of the resource. (Palmer, p.5)

Within the context of the thematic collection here, it would be desirable and advantageous to add metadata and tagging features for structuring the resource and conventions would need to be created toward that end. Reading is an important component of the services/activities that this collection should offer, and metadata, tagging, search capacities, hypertext and so forth will need to be supported. As Palmer states, "scholarship is embedded in the product and its use." (Palmer, p.4) Therefore, it will also be advantageous to notify and market the resource to at least the colleges involved, and welcome linking to the resource. Collaboration here will be an important and exciting factor, and should prove beneficial to all institutions involved in the project, and should lead to the "creation of contextually rich thematic collections." Increased digitization efforts may need to be encouraged (and funded!) among these institutions, which likely will not have the digital repository efforts of larger research libraries underway, toward the establishment of digital archives or digital special collections. Such a thematic collection as the Historic Women Poets from the Seven Sisters Schools named here would be a worthy historical tribute to literature, history, and gender studies, and would certainly be possible as outlined above (and by other means), especially if collaboration between this network of schools is achieved.

ᚼ ᚼ

A Brief Note on the Font

Goudy Bookletter 1911, first seen on DaFont.com in May of 2008, features a "moderately rough text face" and is based on Kennerley Old Style. Originally, letters might have variations in their details when their metal counterparts were pressed onto paper. Named after Frederic W. Goudy, the publisher who commissioned Kennerley Old Style, that typeface was born in 1911. Goudy Bookletter 1911 hopes to recreate a bit of the nuances of Kennerley Old Style and is as much a tribute to Frederick W. Goudy as it is to Kennerley Old Style itself.